WEB COPY

Order QR

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 29.10.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

Crl.O.P.No.30153 of 2026

CNR: {HCMA012520422026}

Vinoth Kumar
S/o Balakrishnan,
No.27/2, Muthamil Nagar,
Kallikuppam, Ambattur,
Chennai.

...Petitioner

Vs

State Rep by
The Deputy Superintendent
NIBCID, Chennai.
Crime No. 11 of 2026

...Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to call for the records and set aside the order in Crl.M.P.No. 5559 of 2026, dated on 09.09.2026 on the file of the Principal Special Judge under EC and NDPS Act, Chennai.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. S. Karthikeyan
For Mr. P.Veeranarayanan

For Respondent(s): Mr. A. Amarnath
Additional Public Prosecutor

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed challenging the order dated 09.09.2026 passed by the learned Principal Special Judge under the EC and NDPS Acts, Chennai, in Crl.M.P. No. 5559 of 2026, whereby the time for filing the final report in Crime No. 11 of 2026 was extended.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, acting upon secret information, the respondent conducted a search on 17.03.2026 and allegedly found the petitioner and the other accused persons in possession of 220 kg of ganja in the car in which they were travelling. Accordingly, the respondent registered an FIR in Crime No.11 of 2026 for the offences punishable under Section 8(c) read with Sections 20(b)(ii)(C) and 25 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as the "NDPS Act"). After registration of the FIR, all the accused persons were arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 17.03.2026. Thereafter, the respondent failed to file the final report within the statutory period of 180 days prescribed under Section 36A(4) of the NDPS Act.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

3. In the meanwhile, the petitioner filed a petition seeking default bail under Section 187(3) of the BNSS. However, the said petition was returned on 12.10.2026, on the ground that the prosecution had already filed Crl.M.P. No. 5559 of 2026 seeking extension of time for completing the investigation and filing the final report under Section 36A(4) of the NDPS Act, and that the learned Trial Court had, by order dated 09.09.2026, extended the period for completion of the investigation. Aggrieved by the said order of extension, the petitioner has filed the present Criminal Original Petition contending that the prosecution had failed to disclose any valid or sufficient grounds warranting extension of the statutory period for completing the investigation and filing the final report, thereby affecting the petitioner's right to seek default bail.

4. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials placed before this Court.

5. On perusal of the records, it is seen that the petitioner is arrayed as the first accused (A1) in Crime No. 11 of 2026 and was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 17.03.2026. Therefore, the respondent was required to complete the investigation and file the final report within the statutory period

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

of 180 days, as prescribed under Section 36A(4) of the NDPS Act. However, since the respondent could not complete the investigation within the stipulated period, a petition in Crl.M.P. No. 5559 of 2026 was filed under Section 36A(4) of the NDPS Act, seeking extension of time. The grounds set out by the prosecution in the said petition were that, pursuant to the confession statements of A1 and A2, one Bharathkumar, stated to be their associate, was secured on 22.07.2026. It was further stated that, based on the confession statements of A1 to A3, another person, namely, Joshwa, was yet to be apprehended for the purpose of completing the investigation. On these grounds, the prosecution sought further time to complete the investigation and file the final report. The learned Trial Court, upon consideration of the said petition, allowed the request and extended the period for completion of the investigation.

6. However, the respondent has failed to satisfy the twin requirements contemplated under Section 36A(4) of the NDPS Act, namely, furnishing a report indicating the progress of the investigation and specifying the particular reasons necessitating the further detention of the accused beyond the statutory period of 180 days. The prosecution has not adequately demonstrated the progress made in the investigation or disclosed any specific and justifiable grounds warranting an extension of the period of detention.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Therefore, this Court finds that the prosecution has failed to place sufficient and valid reasons before the learned Trial Court to justify the extension of the statutory period.

7. At this juncture, it is relevant to extract the provision contained in Section 36A(4) of the NDPS Act, 1985, which reads as follows:

> *"Section 36A(4) -- In respect of persons accused of an offence punishable under section 19 or section 24 or section 27A or for offences involving commercial quantity the references in sub-section (2) of section 167 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), thereof to "ninety days", where they occur, shall be construed as reference to "one hundred and eighty days":*
>
> *Provided that, if it is not possible to complete the investigation within the said period of one hundred and eighty days, the Special Court may extend the said period up to one year on the report of the Public Prosecutor indicating the progress of the investigation and the specific reasons for the detention of the accused beyond the said period of one hundred and eighty days."*

Thus, it is clear that the learned Trial Court is empowered to extend the period for completion of the investigation up to a maximum of one year, subject to the fulfilment of the statutory requirements under Section 36A(4) of the NDPS

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Act. Such an extension can be granted only on the basis of a report submitted by the Public Prosecutor, indicating the progress of the investigation and specifying the particular reasons necessitating the further detention of the accused beyond the initial period of 180 days. In the absence of a report satisfying the aforesaid mandatory requirements, any extension of the period of detention would be contrary to the statutory mandate.

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, in ***Sanjay Kumar Kedia v. Intelligence Officer, Narcotics Control Bureau***, reported in ***(2009) 17 SCC 631***, has emphasised the mandatory nature of the requirements prescribed under Section 36A(4) of the NDPS Act. Further, an unjustified extension of detention would also have implications for the accused's right to speedy investigation and trial guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

9. Therefore, this Court is of the considered view that the learned Trial Courts and the learned Public Prosecutors dealing with cases under the NDPS Act must be apprised of the scope and mandatory requirements governing an application filed under Section 36A(4) of the said Act. Unless the Public Prosecutor submits a report clearly indicating the progress of the investigation and setting out specific and compelling reasons necessitating the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

further detention of the accused beyond the statutory period of 180 days, the learned Trial Court ought not to have granted an extension of time for completion of the investigation and filing of the final report. In the present case, the mandatory requirements contemplated under Section 36A(4) of the NDPS Act have not been duly complied with. Consequently, the impugned order granting extension of time cannot be sustained in law and is liable to be set aside.

10. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 09.09.2026 passed by the learned Principal Special Judge under EC & NDPS Act, Chennai, in Crl.M.P.No.5559 of 2026, is hereby set aside. The petitioner shall be released on bail forthwith, on executing a bond for a sum of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-Five Thousand only), with two blood relative sureties for a like sum each, to the satisfaction of the learned Principal Special Judge under EC & NDPS Act, Chennai, and on further conditions that:

[a] the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the learned Judge may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity.

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily twice at 10.30 a.m. & 5.30 p.m., until further orders.

[c] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

[d] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560].**

[f] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229A IPC.

11. The Registry is directed to circulate a copy of this order to all the Principal District Judges in the State of Tamil Nadu, who shall, in turn, circulate the same among the Judicial Officers dealing with cases under the NDPS Act in their respective districts, with a direction to ensure strict compliance with the statutory requirements prescribed under Section 36A(4) of the NDPS Act.

12. With the above directions, the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed.

29.10.2026

Index : Yes/No
Neutral citation : Yes/No
Speaking/non-speaking order
rts

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

To

1. The Principal Special Judge under EC and NDPS Act,
Chennai.

2. The Deputy Superintendent,
NIBCID, Chennai.

3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai.

4. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court, Chennai.

5. The Registrar (Judicial)
Madras High Court,
Chennai.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Order QR

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J,

rts

Crl.O.P.No.30153 of 2026

29.10.2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis